

RECENT ENTOMOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

A CATALOGUE OF NORTH AMERICAN DIPTERA. BY J. M. ALDRICH. (Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collection, Vol. XLVI, Pages 1-680, 1905.) About twenty years have elapsed since the publication of Baron Osten Sacken's catalogue of the North American Diptera. A catalogue such as the author now presents is one of the greatest *stimuli* to the study of any group, and it should be possible to have such works bearing on all of the orders published more frequently.

This work has the same faunal limits as the Osten Sacken catalogue of 1878, *i.e.* south to Panama and including the entire West Indies.

The first and natural question to be asked was, "How many species are there in the new list?" This I could not answer, for double the number contained in the Osten Sacken catalogue does not convey a very clear idea of the number of species recorded, so that an actual count seemed to be the only solution; a single count, barring all synonyms and cross references, but including all "unrecognizable" and doubtful species, gave 8,191; if to this we add the species described in 1904 as given in the appendix (about 229), we have a total of 8,420 species. It would be safe to cancel the 420 and to say there are probably about 8,000 described species.

The author's loyalty to Baron Osten Sacken, who laid the foundation for dipterological study in America, is beyond question, while the following expression shows the true spirit in which a work of this kind should be produced: "I have been influenced by the feeling that my catalogue must represent the actual condition of classification not merely my own views." A catalogue is not the place for radical changes, "fixity" should be the guiding star, and it is only from this standpoint that I wish to criticise. When types exist we cannot ignore the species until the types have been thoroughly studied; because the types represent two species is no reason for dropping the name and adopting a more recent one, unless both species have been previously described; species should be selected by elimination, the same as genera. I refer principally to Miss Gertrude Ricardo's papers on the Tabanidae in the British Museum collection, published in the *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, 1900-1902, and adopted by Hine in his *Tabanidae of Ohio*. This would make the following changes in the

genus *Chrysops aestuans* V.d.W., 1867, = *mærens* Walker, 1848; *atropos* O. S. 1875, = *divisus* Walker, 1848; *fugax* O. S. 1875, = *carbonarius* Walker, 1848; *furcator* Walker, is a good species and not a syn. of *striatus* O. S.

In the Stratiomyidae there are the following omissions: *Euparyphus major* Hine (Ohio Nat. I., 112, 1901), and *Akronia frontosa* Hine (*l. c.* 113). *Pachygaster maculicornis* Hine, belongs to the genus *Neopachygaster* of Austen.

In the Bombylidae I note the absence of *Systoechus solitus* Walker, a species which seems to be quite distinct from *vulgaris*. The name of *Hyperalonia serveillei* Macquart, presents an interesting question in nomenclature,—whether a name based on what is apparently a recognizable figure, but without a description or locality, shall be accepted. The *Bombylius philadelphicus* of the New Jersey list is a very different species from the *B. mexicanus* Wiedeman, but whether it represents Macquart's species is somewhat doubtful.

Lestomyia fallii Coquillett, and *Erax dubius* Will. seem to be omitted. *Erax albibarbis*, Macq., 1839, should be the species, not *cinerascens* Bellardi, 1861. *Holopogon philadelphicus* Schiner, is undoubtedly a synonym of *guttula* Wied. I only note the omission of *Criorhina nigra*, Will. (Synopsis, p. 214), in the Syrphidae.

A name omitted in the Dexiidae is *Metadexia flavipes* Coq. The type is in my collection, it has proved to be a synonym of *Thelairodes basalis* Giglio-Tos. We cannot blame the author for overlooking *Phorbia cepetorum* Meade, published under the title, "Annotated List of British Anthomyiidae," in the Entomologist's Monthly Magazine, March, 1882, p. 218, where he also refers to American specimens received from Professor Lintner of Albany.

I beg to differ with the author in regard to ignoring recognizable descriptions where no locality is given, noticeably, the use of *Amphicnephes pertusus* Loew, 1873, instead of *pulla* Wiedemann, 1830, and of *Ischnomyia vittula* Loew, 1863, in place of *albicosta* Walker, 1849. *Tephronota narytia* Walker, 1849, will have to be adopted in place of *ruficeps* Van der Wulp, 1867, notwithstanding the fact that of the "four specimens in the British Museum, two of them are *Chetopsis ænea* and that one of these bears Walker's label, 'Narytia' ", (Osten Sacken Cat., p. 260), the description applies very clearly to the other two, and not to *C. ænea*, Wied. *Sepsisoma flavescens* Johnson, *Tephritis nora* Doane, *Ophthalmomyia bisignata* Coq., *Eudicrana obumbrata* Loew, and *Nycteribia bellardi* Rond., seem to be omitted. Considering the amount of work involved in preparing a catalogue of this kind, the omissions are very few and the author deserves all the praise it is possible to give for his careful and thorough work. C. W. J.